DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 278 TM 850 764

AUTHOR Federico, Pat-Anthony
TITLE Computer-Managed Instruction: Crystallized and Fluid Intelligence.
INSTITUTION Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, San Diego, Calif.
REPORT NO NPRDC-TR-85-36
PUB DATE Sep 85
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Aptitude; Aptitude Tests; *Aptitude Treatment Interaction; *Cognitive Ability; Cognitive Style; Computer Assisted Instruction; *Computer Managed Instruction; Discriminant Analysis; Educational Environment; Electricity; Electronics; *Intelligence; *Mastery Learning; Military Training; Postsecondary Education
IDENTIFIERS Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery; *Crystallized Intelligence; *Fluid Intelligence

ABSTRACT

Twenty-four measures of crystallized intelligence (G sub c) and fluid intelligence (G sub f) were obtained for samples of graduates and failures of an innovative instructional situation in which computer-managed mastery learning was used to teach elementary electricity and electronics. Seven stepwise multiple discriminant analyses and associated statistics were computed to determine which linear combinations of G sub f and G sub c measures would optimally separate the two groups. Corresponding classification functions derived for the discriminant analyses were applied to the data to evaluate the effectiveness of differentiating failures and graduates. The results did not substantiate the hypothesis that G sub f measures would be associated more strongly with student success in a new instructional situation than would G sub c measures. Contrary to theory, the findings suggest that some unconventional educational environments are not necessarily dysfunctional for more able students. In these situations, they can just as easily exercise and exploit those skills developed and applied in more traditional instructional settings. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NPRDC TR 85-36

September 1985

COMPUTER-MANAGED INSTRUCTION: CRYSTALLIZED AND FLUID INTELLIGENCE

Pat-Anthony Federico

Reviewed by
E. G. Aiken

Approved by
J. C. McLachlan

Released by
J. E. Kohler
Commander, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

Navy Personnel Research and Development Center
San Diego, California 92152-6800

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED	1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY	3. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.
2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) NPRDC TR 85-36	5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Navy Personnel Research and Development Center 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (*If applicable*) Code 51	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION
6c. ADDRESS (*City, State, and ZIP Code*) San Diego, CA 92152-6800	7b. ADDRESS (*City, State, and ZIP Code*)
8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Office of Naval Technology 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (*If applicable*)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
8c. ADDRESS (*City, State, and ZIP Code*) Washington, DC 20350	10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 63720N; PROJECT NO. RF63-522; TASK NO. 801-013; WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. 03.04

11. TITLE (*Include Security Classification*)

COMPUTER-MANAGED INSTRUCTION: CRYSTALLIZED AND FLUID INTELLIGENCE

12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)
Federico, Pat-Anthony

13a. TYPE OF REPORT	13b. TIME COVERED	14. DATE OF REPORT (*Year, Month, Day*)	15. PAGE COUNT
Technical Report	FROM 84 Mar TO 84 Sep	1985 September	25

16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION

17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (*Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number*)
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	
05	09		Computer-managed instruction, mastery learning, crystallized intelligence, fluid intelligence, aptitude-treatment-interaction

19. ABSTRACT (*Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number*)

Twenty-four measures crystallized intelligence (G_c) and fluid intelligence (G_f) were obtained for samples of graduates and failures of an innovative instructional situation in which computer-managed mastery learning was used to teach elementary electricity and electronics. Seven stepwise multiple discriminant analyses and associated statistics were computed to determine which linear combinations of G_f and G_c measures would optimally separate the two groups. Corresponding classification functions derived for the discriminant analyses were applied to the data to evaluate the effectiveness of differentiating failures and graduates. The results did not substantiate the hypothesis that G_f measures would be associated more strongly with student success in a new instructional situation than would G_c measures. Contrary to theory, the findings suggest that some unconventional educational environments are not necessarily dysfunctional for more able students. In these situations, they can just as easily exercise and exploit those skills developed and applied in more traditional instructional settings.

20. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT	21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION	
☒ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☐ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS	UNCLASSIFIED	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Pat-Anthony Federico	22b. TELEPHONE (*Include Area Code*) (619) 225-6434	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL Code 51

DD FORM 1473, 84 MAR

83 APR edition may be used until exhausted.
All other editions are obsolete.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE
UNCLASSIFIED

FOREWORD

This research was performed under exploratory development work unit RF63-522-801-013-03.04 (Testing Strategies for Operational Computer-based Training) under the sponsorship of the Chief of Naval Material (Office of Naval Technology). The general goal of this work unit is to evaluate the impact of different computer-based testing strategies for operational training.

The results of this study are primarily intended for the Department of Defense training and testing research and development community.

J. E. KOHLER
Commander, U.S. Navy
Commanding Officer

JAMES W. TWEEDDALE
Technical Director

SUMMARY

Background and Problem

Two types of intelligence have been defined: (1) crystallized intelligence (G_c), which consists of good predictors of conventional educational accomplishment or scholastic ability (e.g., verbal, quantitative, vocabulary, reading comprehension, information, mathematical, and prior scholastic achievement) and (2) fluid intelligence (G_f), which consists of assembly and control processes that adapt strategies for solving novel and immediate problems (e.g., abstract, spatial, figural, and nonverbal reasoning).

In unconventional instructional treatments, such as in computer-managed mastery learning, G_c becomes less important to learning and an aptitude-treatment-interaction (ATI) will likely appear. The ATI approach to teaching emphasizes the use of aptitude measures for selecting instructional strategies or treatments to help individuals attain educational objectives. Consequently, Snow (1980) hypothesized that students who lack well-developed, conventional, academic aptitudes and abilities (G_c) will benefit from unconventional instructional situations, while those who possess these skills may not be able to apply them in these environments.

Computer-managed mastery learning is a form of computer-managed instruction (CMI). It is individualized instruction with carefully defined objectives, hierarchical content, modular presentation and assesment, diagnostic achievement tests, and immediate feedback to students. This instructional approach may structure, segment, and direct learning for students who cannot do so for themselves.

Snow also hypothesized that this unconventional instructional treatment probably makes learning more difficult for the students who can organize and process their own learning. Therefore, G_c is probably of no particular advantage in unconventional instructional situations such as computer-managed mastery learning. He expected that G_f would be associated with achievement in innovative instructional situations--that differ from those the students experienced in the past--and G_c would be irrelevant.

Objective

The purpose of this exploratory development was to test the hypothesis that measures of fluid intelligence (G_f) would be associated more with student success in unconventional or innovative instructional situations, such as computer-managed mastery learning, than would measures of crystallized intelligence (G_c).

Approach

Twenty-four measures of crystallized and fluid intelligence were obtained for samples of graduates and failures of basic electricity and electronics school--an innovative instructional situation in which computer-managed mastery learning is used to teach elementary electricity and electronics. Seven stepwise multiple discriminant analyses and associated statistics were computed to determine which linear combinations of G_c and G_f measures would optimally separate the two groups. Corresponding classification functions derived for the discriminant analyses were applied to the data to evaluate the effectiveness of differentiating failures and graduates.

Results

Measures of crystallized intelligence accounted for more of the discrimination between CMI failures and graduates than measures of fluid intelligence. Assuming either equal or adjusted probability of graduating or failing, crystallized intelligence measures correctly classified a greater number of actual failures and graduates than did fluid intellignece measures. Employing crystallized and fluid intelligence measures simultaneously, always classified a higher percentage of students correctly than did employing only measures of fluid intelligence. Assuming adjusted probability, actual failures were better classified using crystallized intelligence indices than crystallized and fluid intelligence indices combined. The data demonstrated that measures of crystallized intelligence are more important for predicting performance in a CMI environment, an instance of a new instructional situation, than measures of fluid intelligence.

Discussion and Conclusions

Unlike Snow's speculations, the findings suggested that some unconventional educational environments are not necessarily dysfunctional for more able students. In these situations, they can just as easily exercise and capitalize upon those skills developed and applied in more traditional instructional settings.

If innovative instructional situations are used, then the relevancy of crystallized intelligence to learning is not lessened. Students who possess well-developed, conventional, academic aptitudes and abilities are able to apply them even in unorthodox, educational environments. Students who lack these accumulated skills will need to acquire them in order to benefit from nontraditional as well as traditional instruction.

Evidently, crystallized intelligence, representing prior assemblies of performance processes, can be retrieved and applied anew in an instructional situation unlike those experienced in the past. This implies that crystallized intelligence begins to take on some of the alleged attributes of fluid intelligence, especially considering adaptations to novel educational environments. The declared distinction between long-term assembly for transfer to familiar new situations, crystallized intelligence, and short-term assembly for transfer to unfamiliar new situations, fluid intelligence, tends to disappear. Alternatively, if this difference does not vanish, G_c abilities and aptitudes are adaptive and advantageous in innovative instructional situations such as computer-managed mastery learning employed in this reported research.

Lastly, this computer-managed instruction may not have been innovative enough when compared to previously experienced educational environments. Consequently, it would not be expected to elicit accommodative G_f strategies more than G_c abilities and aptitudes used by students in traditional instructional settings.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Purpose	2
METHOD	2
Subjects	2
Measures of Crystallized and Fluid Intelligence	3
New Instructional Situation	3
Computer-managed Instruction	3
Mastery Learning	5
Learning Materials	5
Statistical Analyses	5
RESULTS	7
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	14
REFERENCES	17
DISTRIBUTION LIST	19

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Measures of Fluid (G_f) and Crystallized (G_c) Intelligence	4
2.	Subject-matter Content of 11 (CMI) Modules of BE/E School	6
3.	Means, Standard Deviations, and Univariate F-ratios for CMI Failures and Graduates on the Tests Measuring G_f and G_c	8
4.	Intercorrelation Matrix of G_f (Tests 1-6) and G_c (Tests 7-24) Measures	9
5.	Summary of Stepwise Discriminant Analyses Using Measures G_f and G_c	10
6.	Prediction Results Based on Derived Classification Functions	13

INTRODUCTION

Background

According to Snow (1980), Cattel's (1971) crystallized intelligence, G_c, represents a general dimension of measures that are good predictors of conventional educational achievement or scholastic ability (e.g., verbal, quantitative, vocabulary, reading comprehension, information, mathematical, and prior scholastic achievement). Cattel's (1971) fluid intelligence, G_f, represents another general dimension of measures that represents assembly and control processes necessary to structure adaptive strategies for solving novel and immediate problems (e.g., abstract, spatial, figural, and nonverbal reasoning).

In attempting to answer why G_c measures are often better predictors of learning outcome than are G_f measures, Snow (1980) speculated:

> One reason may be that G_c represents the long-term accumulation of knowledge and skills, organized into functional cognitive systems by prior learning, that are in some sense crystallized as units for use in future learning. Because these are products of past education, and because education is in large part accumulative, transfer relations between past and future learning are assured. The transfer need not be primarily of specific knowledge but rather of organized academic learning skills. Thus G_c may represent prior assemblies of performance processes retrieved as a system and applied anew in instructional situations not unlike those experienced in the past, whereas G_f may represent new assemblies of performance processes needed in more extreme adaptations to novel situations. The distinction, then, is between long-term assembly for transfer to familiar new situations versus short-term assembly for transfer to unfamiliar new situations. (p. 37)

Computer-managed instruction (CMI) is employed to implement mastery learning of many complex curricula; for example, basic electricity and electronics (Baker, 1978; Kearsley, 1983; Kearsley, Hunter, & Seidel, 1983a, 1983b; Kulik, Kulik, & Cohen, 1980; Orlansky & String, 1980, 1981). This pedagogical implementation can probably be considered a "new" learning situation in Snow's (1980) scheme of things:

> What constitutes a "new" learning situation is not really clear. But one can predict that as an instructional situation involves combinations of new technology (e.g., computerized instruction or television), new symbol systems (e.g., computer graphics or artistic expressions), new content (e.g., topological mathematics or astrophysics), and/or new contexts (e.g., independent learning, collaborative teamwork in simulation games), G_f should become more important and G_c less important. (p. 59)

CMI can also be viewed as a relatively new instructional technology. The comprehension of many circuit schematics and the solution of numerous algebraic equations can be

thought of as new symbol systems. The perception of several relationships among voltage, resistance, and current, as well as the reduction of complicated circuits to simpler ones, can be conceived as new content. Self-study, self-pacing, and mastery learning can be regarded as new contexts. According to Snow, the relationship of G_c to achievement should be stronger in ordinary educational environments. This has been established in much of the aptitude-treatment-interaction (ATI) research (Cronbach & Snow, 1977).

If the typical instructional treatment is altered, as in computer-managed mastery learning, the association of G_c to learning decreases and an ATI will likely appear. Consequently, according to Snow (1980), students who lack well-developed, conventional, academic aptitudes and abilities will benefit from the unorthodox, educational treatment; while those who possess these skills may not be able to apply them in unconventional instructional situations. Computer-managed mastery learning is individualized instruction with carefully defined objectives, hierarchical content, modular presentation and assessment, diagnostic achievement tests, and immediate feedback on student progress. This pedagogical approach structures, segments, and directs learning for less able students by doing for them what they cannot do for themselves. Snow maintained that this unconventional instructional treatment is probably dysfunctional for more able students, who can organize and control their own learning because of the nature of the cognitive processing required and acquired previously by conventional, educational experiences. Therefore, G_c intelligence is probably of no particular advantage in novel instructional situations such as computer-managed mastery learning. Within this context, Snow expected that G_f would be associated with achievement in innovative instructional situations--different from those students experienced in the past. In these novel educational environments, G_c will likely be irrelevant; and G_f, relevant.

Purpose

The purpose of this exploratory development was to test the hypothesis that measures of fluid intelligence (G_f) would be associated more with student success in unconventional or innovative instructional situations, such as computer-managed mastery learning, than would measures of crystallized intelligence (G_c).

METHOD

Subjects

The original sample of subjects consisted of 340 graduates from recruit training at the Naval Training Center, San Diego (NTC) who were scheduled for instruction at the Basic Electricity and Electronics (BE/E) School at NTC. Before beginning BE/E orientation, the subjects were administered tests of G_c and G_f. Data for 20 subjects who failed to follow directions and/or to complete 9 of the 12 tests were discarded. Of the remaining 320 subjects, 40 failed to graduate from BE/E School--35 for academic reasons and 5 for nonacademic reasons. Thus, data were available for 315 BE/E trainees--280 graduates and 35 academic failures.

The subtests of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) (MEPCOM Manual 601-1) provide some measures of G_c for all Navy entrants. In this study, 108 BE/E

graduates had incomplete or missing ASVAB scores or had been administered the Basic Test Battery (BTB) instead of the ASVAB. (Before the ASVAB was adopted, the BTB was used routinely for measuring aptitudes.) Thus, the final sample used in the study consisted of 207 BE/E trainees--172 graduates and 35 academic failures.

Measures of Crystallized and Fluid Intelligence

The 24 G_f and G_c measures used in this study (see Table 1) are in three categories: cognitive styles, abilities, and aptitudes. Cognitive styles are the dominant modes of information processing that individuals typically employ when perceiving, learning, problem solving, and decision making. Abilities are the general intellectual capabilities of individuals that are pervasive to the performance of many tasks. Aptitudes are indices used to select personnel to perform tasks that demand specific skills and to find the right person for a certain job or school.

Six measures of cognitive styles were selected as indices of G_f because they are chiefly abstract, spatial, figural, and nonverbal reasoning tests as well as having implications for academic achievement and instruction (Kogan, 1971). Six ability and 12 aptitude measures were selected as indices of G_c because they are chiefly verbal, quantitative, vocabulary, reading comprehension, information, and mathematical reasoning tests as well as representing various types of information-processing tasks (Carroll, 1975) and being relevant to the BE/E curriculum. The 12 aptitude indices of G_c were chosen because they are ASVAB subtests that were thought to be readily available for Navy personnel and also because these scores are the basis of assigning individuals to different types of Navy schools. All of these measures are moderate to high in reliability, paper and pencil in nature, and fairly short in duration. Federico and Landis (1984) established the relative dependence of most cognitive style measures of G_f with ability and aptitude measure G_c inherent to general problem solving and the relative independence of some cognitive measures of G_f from technical aptitude and verbal ability measures of G_c.

New Instructional Situation

The unconventional instructional treatment consisted of the first 11 modules of the BE/E school curriculum. This involved CMI to implement the mastery learning of the subject matter of the modules.

Computer-managed Instruction

In CMI, students self-study and self-pace themselves through off-line lesson modules; that is, they do not interact directly with the system while learning. (This is unlike computer-assisted instruction where course contents and tests are stored in the computer with which the student interacts in real time by means of on-line terminals.) Also, in CMI, the computer via its distributed terminals (1) scores criterion-referenced multiple-choice tests that the students take off-line, (2) interprets test results and provides feedback to each student regarding his/her performance, (3) advises the student to learn the next or alternative lesson or to repeat mastery modules, and (4) manages student records, instructional resources, and administrative data (Baker, 1978; Orlansky & String, 1980, 1981).

Table 1

Measures of Fluid (G_f) and Crystallized (G_c) Intelligence

Factor	Abbreviation	Description	Measurement Instrument
		Fluid Intelligence, G_f	
Cognitive Styles			
1. Field-independence vs. Field-dependence	FILDINDP	Analytical vs. global orientation	Hidden Figures Test, Part I (Ekstrom, French, Harman, and Derman, 1976)
2. Conceptualizing Style	CONCSTYL	Span of conceptual category	Clayton-Jackson Object Sorting Test (Clayton & Jackson, 1961)
3. Reflectiveness-Impulsiveness	REFLIMPL	Deliberation vs. impulse	Impulsivity Subscale from Personality Research Test, Form E (Jackson, 1974).
4. Tolerance of Ambiguity	TOLRAMBQ	Inclined to accept complex issues	Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale from Self-Other Test, Form C (Rydell & Rosen, 1966).
5. Category Width	CATEWIDH	Consistency of cognitive range	Category Width Scale (Pettigrew, 1958).
6. Cognitive Complexity	COGCOMPX	Multidimensional perceptions of environment	Group Version of Role Construct Repertory Test (Bieri, Atkins, Briar, Leaman, Miller, & Tripodi, 1966)
		Crystallized Intelligence, G_c	
Abilities			
7. Verbal Comprehension	VERBCOMP	Understanding the English language	Vocabulary Test, Part I (Ekstrom et al., 1976)
8. General Reasoning	GENLREAS	Solving specific problems	Arithmetic Aptitude Test, Part I (Ekstrom et al., 1976)
9. Associational Fluency	ASSOFLUN	Producing similar words rapidly	Controlled Associations Test, Part I (Ekstrom et al., 1976)
10. Logical Reasoning	LOGIREAS	Deducing from premise to conclusion	Nonsense Syllogisms Test, Part I (Ekstrom et al., 1976)
11. Induction	INDUCTON	Forming hypotheses to fit certain facts	Figure Classification Test, Part I (Ekstrom et al., 1976)
12. Ideational Fluency	IDEAFLUN	Generating ideas about a specific type	Topics Test, Part I (Ekstrom et al., 1976)
Aptitudes			
13. General Information	GENLINFO	Recognizing factual information	General Information Subtest, ASVAB
14. Numerical Operations	NUMROPER	Completing arithmetic operations	Numerical Operations Subtest, ASVAB
15. Attention to Detail	ATTNDETL	Finding an important detail	Attention to Detail Subtest, ASVAB
16. Word Knowledge	WORDKNOL	Comprehending written and spoken language	Word Knowledge Subtest, ASVAB
17. Arithmetic Reasoning	ARTHREAS	Solving arithmetic word problems	Arithmetic Reasoning Subtest, ASVAB
18. Space Perception	SPACPERC	Visualizing objects in space	Space Perception Subtest, ASVAB
19. Mathematics Knowledge	MATHKNOL	Employing mathematical relationships	Mathematics Knowledge Subtest, ASVAB
20. Electronics Information	ELECINFO	Using electronics relationships	Electronics Information Subtest, ASVAB
21. Mechanical Comprehension	MECHCOMP	Reasoning with mechanical concepts	Mechanical Comprehension Test, ASVAB
22. General Science	GENLSCIE	Perceiving relationships between scientific concepts	General Science Subtest, ASVAB
23. Shop Information	SHOPINFO	Knowing shop tools	Shop Information Subtest, ASVAB
24. Automotive Information	AUTOINFO	Knowing automotive functions	Automotive Information Subtest, ASVAB

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mastery Learning

Mastery learning has many major features:

1. Mastery is measured relative to the specific instructional objectives every student is required to master.

2. The instruction itself is structured in clearly defined learning units or modules.

3. The student must master each module completely before proceeding to the next module.

4. A diagnostic objectives-referenced test is administered to every student at the end of each module to provide feedback on the adequacy of the student's learning.

5. Based upon the diagnostic information, the student's original instruction is repeated or supplemented so that he/she can successfully master the module.

6. Time to complete each module is used as the means of individualizing instruction and thus promoting mastery of the material (Block, 1974; Bloom, 1974, 1976).

Learning Materials

The individualized learning materials were a set of 11 hierarchical learning modules that teach basic facts, concepts, principles, and rules regarding basic electricity and electronics. These modules were selected because students from all electronics-related Navy ratings must master them before proceeding to more specialized training. Each module was presented as a self-study booklet consisting of three to seven lessons. To learn a lesson within a booklet, students could choose, based upon their experience and preference, a narrative presentation, programmed instruction, and/or straightforward summary. The alternative training treatments for a lesson could be complemented by enrichment material or the instructor if the student desired. Learners were encouraged to use any or all of the instructional resources that they considered necessary to master the modular material. The descriptive prose in each booklet was supplemented by many schematics, circuit diagrams, photographs of meters, and algebraic expressions. Typically, the presentation of the many facts, concepts, principles, and rules was followed by appropriate examples.

Table 2 presents subject-matter content of the 11 modules.

Statistical Analyses

Seven stepwise multiple discriminant analyses were computed to determine which linear combinations of G_c and G_f tests optimally differentiated between BE/E failures and graduates. These separate analyses were calculated using (1) cognitive style, ability, or aptitude indices of G_c and G_f, (2) the three two-way interactions of these measures, and (3) the one three-way interaction. In these analyses, multivariate normality and homogeneity of group dispersions were assumed.

Table 2

Subject-matter Content of 11 (CMI) Modules of BE/E School

Module Number	Subject-matter Content
1	Electrical current--electricity and the electron, electron movement, current flow, measurement of current, and the ammeter.
2	Voltage--electromotive force from chemical action, magnetism, electromagnetic induction, AC voltage, uses of AC and DC, and measuring voltage.
3	Resistance--characteristics of resistance, resistors, resistor values, and ohmmeters.
4	Measuring current and voltage in series circuits--measuring current in a series circuit, voltage in a series current, and using the multimeter as a voltmeter.
5	Relationships of current, voltage, and resistance--voltage, resistance, and current, Ohm's law formula, power, internal resistance, and troubleshooting series circuits.
6	Parallel circuits--rules for voltage and current, rules for resistance and power, variational analysis, and troubleshooting parallel circuits.
7	Combination circuits and voltage dividers--solving complex circuits, voltage reference, and voltage dividers.
8	Induction--electromagnetism, inductors and flux density, inducing voltage, and inductance and induction.
9	Relationships of current, counter electromotive force, and voltage in inductance-resistance circuits--rise and decay of current and voltage, inductance-resistance time constant, using the universal time constant chart, inductive reactance, relationships in inductive circuits, and phase relationships.
10	Transformers--transformer construction, transformer theory and operation, turns and voltage ratios, power and current, transformer efficiency, semiconductor rectifiers.
11	Capacitance--the capacitor, theory of capacitance, total capacitance, resistance-capacitance time constant, capacitive reactance, phase and power relationships, and capacity design considerations.

Classification functions obtained for the derived discriminant functions were applied to the subjects' G_c and G_f measures. Two sets of analyses were conducted. In the first, it was assumed that students who entered BE/E school had an equal probability of failing or graduating. In the second, this probability was adjusted according to the a priori

probabilities of failing and graduating from BE/E school (Cooley & Lohnes, 1962; Overall & Klett, 1972; Tatsuoka, 1971). Records showed that, during the period of interest, the base rates of failing and graduating--for all ratings requiring BE/E school--were 15 and 85 percent respectively. By classifying subjects initially used to produce the discriminant functions and comparing predicted and actual group memberships, it was possible to determine empirically the proportion of correct classifications and, thus, the adequacy of the discriminations.

RESULTS

Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and univariate F-ratios for CMI failures and graduates on the 24 tests of G_f and G_c. Failures scored significantly lower than did the graduates on 2 of the 6 cognitive style, G_f measures, as well as on 4 of the 6 ability and 8 of 12 aptitude, G_c measures. When these test scores were intercorrelated, as shown in Table 4, cognitive styles (G_f) seem to be generally independent of the others, except for field-independence. As expected, however, abilities and aptitudes appear to be related.

Table 5 provides the results of the seven stepwise multiple discriminant analyses computed to determine which linear combination of G_c and G_f measures optimally differentiate CMI failures from graduates, along with their associated statistics. As shown, for each analysis, one discriminant function (D) was derived. For example, for the analysis using G_f measures, cognitive styles, the derived discriminant function is -.81 FILDINDP -.36 CONCSTYL +.26 COGCOMPX. Using this function, only three of the six cognitive styles were needed to discriminate significantly between the two groups. The absolute values of the coefficients in the function indicate how much each of the three G_f measures contributes in discriminating between CMI failures and graduates.

According to this multivariate model, the maximum number of derived discriminant functions is either one less than the number of groups or equal to the number of discriminating variables, whichever is smaller. Since there were only two groups to be differentiated, each analysis yielded only one discriminant function and, consequently, only one eigenvalue (λ). An eigenvalue is a special measure computed in obtaining the discriminant function; it is an index of the relative importance of each differentiating function, and the sum of the eigenvalues indicates the total variance accounted for by the discriminating variables. In this case, having just two groups to be separated, the single eigenvalue reflects the amount of variance accounted for by G_c and G_f measures and their several interactions. A second index can be used as an additional aid in judging the importance of a discriminant function. This is its corresponding canonical correlation, R_c, which reflects the association between a single discriminant function and the set (g-1) dummy variables that define the g group memberships. It indicates how closely the function and the group variable are related and is another index of the function's ability to discriminate among the groups. Wilk's lambda (Λ) statistic and its associated chi-square test of significance indicate the discriminating power existing in the G_f and G_c test scores being used to separate the groups. The discriminating power in these variables decreases as the value of lambda increases. Rao's V, a generalized distance measure, is one criterion that can be used to select the order in which to enter variables into the

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Univariate F-ratios for CMI Failures and Graduates on Tests Measuring G_f and G_c

Test	Failure (N = 35) M	Failure (N = 35) SD	Graduates (N = 172) M	Graduates (N = 172) SD	Univariate F
			G_f		
Cognitive Styles					
1. FILDINSP	2.34	3.38	5.20	3.82	16.82***
2. CONCSTYL	11.0	3.63	12.70	4.07	4.90*
3. REFLIMPL	4.06	2.79	3.33	3.13	1.62
4. TOLRAMBQ	5.57	2.85	5.70	1.98	0.10
5. CATEWIDH	32.34	12.61	31.70	9.59	0.12
6. COGCOMPX	77.20	20.04	72.04	17.71	2.36
			G_c		
Abilities					
7. VERBCOMP	7.40	3.49	8.95	3.23	6.54*
8. GENLREAS	5.00	3.05	8.17	2.95	33.36***
9. ASSOFLUN	9.31	4.34	10.97	4.91	3.44
10. LOGIREAS	1.97	4.06	2.76	4.51	0.92
11. INDUCTON	50.17	15.21	59.72	16.95	9.53**
12. IDEAFLUN	10.00	3.50	11.59	4.34	4.12*
Aptitudes					
13. GENLINFO	55.29	5.44	58.78	6.97	7.81**
14. NUMROPER	48.60	6.71	53.92	7.45	15.29***
15. ATTNDETL	49.20	7.49	51.16	9.57	1.30
16. WORDKNOL	55.80	6.22	59.48	6.30	9.95**
17. ARTHREAS	53.00	8.37	60.20	8.36	21.54***
18. SPACPERC	55.60	7.83	56.24	11.15	0.10
19. MATHKNOL	53.09	5.87	60.44	8.13	25.84***
20. ELECINFO	57.34	5.30	60.58	6.58	7.48**
21. MECHCOMP	56.02	6.81	59.62	6.74	8.21**
22. GENLSCIE	54.80	11.53	60.45	7.66	13.10***
23. SHOPINFO	56.57	5.84	57.78	6.70	0.98
24. AUTOINFO	55.97	6.06	57.55	8.02	1.21

*$p < .05$ ($F(1, 205) \geq 3.84$).
**$p < .01$ ($F(1, 205) \geq 6.64$).
***$p < .001$ ($F(1, 205) \geq 10.83$).

Table 4

Intercorrelation Matrix of G_f (Tests 1-6) and G_c (Tests 7-24) Measures

Test	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
1. FILDINDP	1.00																							
2. CONCSTYL	.14	1.00																						
3. REFLIMPL	-.12	-.14	1.00																					
4. TOLRAMBQ	.01	.03	-.00	1.00																				
5. CATEWIDH	.11	-.05	.16	-.06	1.00																			
6. COGCOMPX	-.08	.03	-.13	-.02	-.19	1.00																		
7. VERBCOMP	.13	.08	-.06	.06	.20	-.14	1.00																	
8. GENLREAS	.25*	.11	-.02	.15	.15	-.06	.61*	1.00																
9. ASSOFLUN	.16	.09	-.09	.01	.08	.02	.39*	.17	1.00															
10. LOGIREAS	.12	.05	-.12	.03	.16	.03	.18*	.35*	.11	1.00														
11. INDUCTON	.15	.09	-.11	-.10	.19*	.01	.15	.15	.15	-.00	1.00													
12. IDEAFLUN	.01	.04	-.02	-.00	.03	.03	.20	.14	.38*	.08	.12	1.00												
13. GENLINFO	.04	.01	.07	.03	.06	-.10	.33	.18	.20	.15	.01	.18*	1.00											
14. NUMROPER	.07	.06	-.11	-.02	.11	.07	.18*	.37*	.07	.10	.08	.21*	.15	1.00										
15. ATTNDETL	-.00	.03	-.04	-.11	.08	-.03	.04	.02	-.04	.09	.12	.11	-.02	.28*	1.00									
16. WORDKNOL	-.02	.05	.09	.06	.04	-.06	.52*	.16	.28*	.11	.07	.22*	.01*	.15	-.00	1.00								
17. ARTHREAS	.08	.03	-.05	.06	.05	-.10	.23*	.38*	.07	.22*	.06	.06	.22*	.39*	.08	.35*	1.00							
18. SPACPERC	.15	-.05	.08	.08	.02	-.09	-.03	.09	.10	-.00	.03	.01	.12	.07	-.02	.11	.20*	1.00						
19. MATHKNOL	.27*	.14	-.05	.03	.08	-.03	.29*	.61*	.16	.23*	.12	.11	.19*	.40*	.12	.30*	.50*	.11	1.00					
20. ELECINFO	.24*	.03	-.09	.06	.02	.02	.28*	.24*	.15	.20*	.10	.10	.32*	.11	-.09	.38*	.22*	.24*	.40*	1.00				
21. MECHCOMP	.20*	.05	.04	-.01	.11	-.00	.19*	.24*	.15	.18*	.18*	.15	.31*	.12	-.00	.35*	.26*	.34*	.31*	.51*	1.00			
22. GENLSCIE	.04	.02	-.03	.06	.12	-.00	.32*	.16	.17	.17	.09	.12	.33*	.02	-.07	.60*	.30*	.17	.33*	.42*	.40*	1.00		
23. SHOPINFO	.00	-.07	-.11	.04	.05	-.00	.17	.12	.01	.11	-.13	.06	.29*	.10	-.08	.26*	.22*	.16	.19*	.67*	.67*	.29*	1.00	
24. AUTOINFO	.12	.05	-.13	.06	.14	-.05	.28*	.18*	.03	.18*	.01	.15	.34*	.12	-.09	.27*	.22*	.16	.19*	.67*	.69*	.30*	.69*	1.00

*$p < .05$, $r(205) \geq .18$.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5

Summary of Stepwise Discriminant Analyses using Measures of G_f and G_c

Step Number	Cognitive Characteristic Entered	Removed	F to Enter or Remove	Wilks Lambda (Λ)	p	Rao's V	Change in Rao's V	p of Change
Cognitive Styles Only (G_f)								
1	FILDINDP		16.82	.92	.00	16.82	16.82	.00
2	CONCSTYL		2.51	.91	.00	19.55	2.73	.10
3	COGCOMPX		1.46	.91	.00	21.16	1.62	.20
Λ = .91; $\chi^2(3) = 19.99$; $p < .001$; $\lambda = .10$.								
CN_f = .68; CN_g = -.14; R_c = .31.								
D = - .81 FILDINDP - .36 CONCSTYL + .26 COGCOMPX.								
C_f = .17 FILDINDP + .63 CONCSTYL + .23 COGCOMPX - 1.27.								
C_g = .35 FILDINDP + .71 CONCSTYL + .22 COGCOMPX - 13.39.								
Abilities Only (G_c)								
1	GENLREAS		33.36	.86	.00	33.36	33.36	.00
2	INDUCTON		4.40	.84	.00	38.50	5.14	.02
Λ = .84; $\chi^2(2) = 35.11$; $p < .001$; $\lambda = .19$.								
CN_f = - .88; CN_g = .18; R_c = .40.								
D = .88 GENLREAS + .35 INDUCTON.								
C_f = .43 GENLREAS + .17 INDUCTON - .32.								
C_g = .77 GENLREAS + .19 INDUCTON - 8.96.								
Aptitudes Only (G_c)								
1	MATHKNOL		25.84	.89	.00	25.84	25.84	.00
2	ARTHREAS		5.11	.87	.00	31.62	5.79	.01
3	GENLSCIE		2.46	.86	.00	34.49	2.86	.10
4	NUMROPER		2.83	.84	.00	37.83	3.35	.07
Λ = .84; $\chi^2(4) = 34.38$; $p < .001$; $\lambda = .18$.								
CN_f = .87; CN_g = - .18; R_c = .40.								
D = - .32 NUMROPER - .29 ARTHREAS - .41 MATHKNOL - .33 GENLSCIE.								
C_f = .67 NUMROPER + .20 ARTHREAS + .29 MATHKNOL + .61 GENLSCIE - 46.17.								
C_g = .72 NUMROPER + .24 ARTHREAS + .36 MATHKNOL + .65 GENLSCIE - 57.46.								
Cognitive Styles and Abilities (G_f + G_c)								
1	GENLREAS		33.36	.86	.00	33.36	33.36	.00
2	FILDINDP		6.90	.83	.00	41.42	8.06	.00
3	INDUCTON		3.06	.82	.00	45.13	3.71	.05
4	CATEWIDH		2.66	.81	.00	48.42	3.29	.07
5	COGCOMPX		1.59	.80	.00	50.43	2.01	.16
6	IDEAFLUN		1.15	.80	.00	51.90	1.47	.22
Λ = .80; $\chi^2(6) = 45.59$; $p < .001$; $\lambda = .25$.								
CN_f = .99; CN_g = - .20; R_c = .45.								
D = - .09 FILDINDP + .03 CATEWIDH + .01 COGCOMPX - .20 GENLREAS - .02 INDUCTON - .04 IDEAFLUN + 1.78.								
C_f = .03 FILDINDP + .34 CATEWIDH + .27 COGCOMPX + .31 GENLREAS + .12 INDUCTON + .40 IDEAFLUN - 21.68.								
C_g = .17 FILDINDP + .30 CATEWIDH - .26 COGCOMPX + .61 GENLREAS + .14 INDUCTON + .45 IDEAFLUN - 23.75.								

Notes.

1. CN_f and CN_g = Centroids for failure and graduate groups respectively.
2. R_c = Canonical correlation between the derived discriminant function and the set of dummy variables defining membership in the two groups.
3. D = Derived discriminant function.
4. C_f and C_g = Classification functions for failure and graduate groups respectively.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5 (Continued)

Step Number	Cognitive Characteristic Entered	Removed	F to Enter or Remove	Wilks Lambda (Λ)	p	Rao's V	Change in Rao's V	p of Change
			Cognitive Styles and Aptitudes (G_f + G_c)					
1	MATHKNOL		25.84	.89	.00	25.84	25.84	.00
2	FILDINDP		7.02	.86	.00	33.78	7.94	.00
3	ARTHREAS		5.76	.83	.00	40.55	6.77	.01
4	GENLSCIE		2.73	.82	.00	43.87	3.32	.07
5	NUMROPER		3.05	.81	.00	47.65	3.78	.05
6	CATEWIDH		1.81	.80	.00	49.94	2.29	.13
7	COGCOMPX		1.78	.80	.00	52.27	2.28	.13
8	SPACPERC		1.64	.79	.00	54.35	2.13	.14
9		MATHKNOL	.90	.79	.00	53.18	-1.17	1.00
10	CONCSTYL		1.20	.79	.00	54.75	1.57	.21

Λ = .79; $\chi^2(8)$ = 47.58; p < .001; λ = .28.

CN_f = - 1.02; CN_g = .21; R_c = 46.

D = .45 FILDINDP + .15 CONCSTYL - .22 CATEWIDH - .21 COGCOMPX + .37 NUMROPER + .30 ARTHREAS - .18 SPACPERC + .38 GENLSCIE.

C_f = - .28 FILDINDP + .67 CONCSTYL + .31 CATEWIDH + .28 COGCOMPX + .59 NUMROPER + .33 ARTHREAS + .40 SPACPERC + .53 GENLSCIE - 68.14.

C_g = - .10 FILDINDP + .73 CONCSTYL + .27 CATEWIDH + .26 COGCOMPX + .66 NUMROPER + .39 ARTHREAS + .38 SPACPERC + .60 GENLSCIE - 76.55.

			Abilities and Aptitudes (G_c)					
1	GENLREAS		33.36	.86	.00	33.36	33.36	.00
2	MATHKNOL		7.51	.83	.00	42.13	8.77	.00
3	INDUCTON		3.50	.82	.00	46.39	4.26	.04
4	GENLSCIE		2.76	.80	.00	49.82	3.43	.06
5	LOGIREAS		1.81	.80	.00	52.12	2.30	.13
6	ARTHREAS		1.62	.79	.00	54.20	2.09	.15

Λ = .79; $\chi^2(6)$ = 47.39; p < .001; λ = .26.

CN_f = 1.01; CN_g = - .21; R_c = .46.

D = - .56 GENLREAS + .21 LOGIREAS - .25 INDUCTON - .22 ARTHREAS - .25 MATHKNOL - .23 GENLSCIE.

C_f = - .72 GENLREAS - .32 LOGIREAS + .13 INDUCTON + .46 ARTHREAS + .56 MATHKNOL + .51 GENLSCIE - 42.46.

C_g = - .45 GENLREAS - .39 LOGIREAS + .16 INDUCTON + .50 ARTHREAS + .61 MATHKNOL + .55 GENLSCIE - 52.49.

			Cognitive Styles, Abilities, and Aptitudes (G_f + G_c)					
1	GENLREAS		33.36	.86	.00	33.36	33.36	.00
2	MATHKNOL		7.51	.83	.00	42.13	8.77	.00
3	FILDINDP		4.31	.81	.00	47.38	5.25	.02
4	GENLSCIE		3.48	.80	.00	51.72	4.34	.04
5	LOGIREAS		2.30	.79	.00	54.66	2.94	.09
6	CATEWIDH		2.02	.78	.00	57.28	2.63	.10
7	INDUCTON		2.69	.77	.00	60.83	3.54	.06
8	NUMROPER		1.98	.76	.00	63.49	2.66	.10
9		MATHKNOL	.86	.77	.00	62.33	-1.15	1.00
10	COGCOMPX		2.00	.76	.00	65.02	2.69	.10
11	SPACPERC		1.39	.75	.00	66.93	1.90	.17
12	ARTHREAS		1.62	.75	.00	69.18	2.25	.13

Λ = .75; $\chi^2(10)$ = 58.15; p < .001; λ = .34.

CN_f = -1.10; CN_g = .23; R_c = .50.

D = .33 FILDINDP - .26 CATEWIDH - .17 COGCOMPX + .43 GENLREAS - .16 LOGIREAS + .22 INDUCTON + .21 NUMROPER + .20 ARTHREAS - .17 SPACPERC + .31 GENLSCIE.

C_f = - .07 FILDINDP + .29 CATEWIDH + .28 COGCOMPX - .91 GENLREAS - .26 LOGIREAS + .10 INDUCTON + .29 NUMROPER + .45 ARTHREAS + .37 SPACPERC + .56 GENLSCIE - 69.82.

C_g = .08 FILDINDP + .24 CATEWIDH + .26 COGCOMPX - .67 GENLREAS - .32 LOGIREAS + .13 INDUCTON + .74 NUMROPER + .49 ARTHREAS + .35 SPACPERC + .63 GENLSCIE - 77.41.

Notes.

1. CN_f and CN_g = Centroids for failure and graduate groups respectively.
2. R_c = Canonical correlation between the derived discriminant fuction and the set of dummy variables defining membership in the two groups.
3. D = Derived discriminant fuction.
4. C_f and C_g = Classification functions for failure and graduate groups respectively.

stepwise discriminant analyses. The variable chosen is the one that contributes to the largest increment in V when added to those previously selected. This produces the greatest overall discrimination of the groups.

In Table 5, the eigenvalues increase from the first discriminant analysis using only cognitive styles as measures of G_f to the second and third analysis using only abilities or aptitudes as measures of G_c. There were similar increases in eigenvalues from the analysis using cognitive styles and abilities through the following ones all the way to the last using cognitive styles, abilities, and aptitudes. The canonical correlations computed for each discriminant analysis increased from the first to the last (i.e., using cognitive styles only to using cognitive styles, abilities, and aptitudes as differentiating variables). The change in Rao's V indicated that:

1. For the analysis using cognitive styles and abilities, G_f measures accounted for 25.74 percent of the increases in this index; and G_c measures, 74.26 percent.

2. For the analysis using cognitive styles and aptitudes, G_f measures accounted for 25.72 percent of the increases; and G_c measures, 74.28 percent .

3. For the analysis using cognitive styles, abilities, and aptitudes, G_f measures accounted for 15.28 percent of the increase; and G_c measures 84.72 percent. Also, Wilk's lambda tended to decrease from the first analysis to the last. All of these statistics seem to imply that G_c measures (abilities and aptitudes) accounted for more variance between CMI failures and graduates than did G_f measures (cognitive styles).

Once the coefficients for each discriminant function were determined, a set of corresponding classification functions (C_f and C_g) were obtained that enable the categorization of CMI students into two groups, failures and graduates respectively. For example, the classification functions obtained from the discriminant function derived for cognitive styles, G_f measures, are:

$$C_f = .17\ \text{FILDINDP} + .63\ \text{CONCSTYL} + .23\ \text{COGCOMPX} - 1.27$$

and

$$C_g = .35\ \text{FILDINDP} + .71\ \text{CONCSTYL} + .22\ \text{COGCOMPX} - 13.39.$$

Thus, by inserting the appropriate test scores for a subject into the derived classification equations, a student could be assigned to the group in which he/she has the highest probability of being a member.

To check the effectiveness of the seven discriminant functions, the classification functions that were obtained were applied to the G_f and G_c test scores of the students who participated in this study, since their actual group membership was known. As indicated previously, separate classification analyses were conducted. In the first, each student who entered the CMI curriculum was assumed to have an equal probability of failing and graduating. In the second, this probability was adjusted according to the a priori probabilities of failing and graduating this CMI course. These results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Prediction Results Based on Derived Classification Functions

Classification Function	Actual Failures (%)		Actual Graduates (%)		χ^2
	Predicted Failures	Predicted Graduates	Predicted Failures	Predicted Graduates	
Equal Probability					
Cognitive Styles	68.60	31.40	38.40	61.60	10.79**
Abilities (A)	74.30	25.70	26.20	73.80	29.89*
Aptitudes (P)	77.10	22.90	23.30	76.70	38.58*
S x A	71.40	28.60	23.80	76.20	30.33*
S x P	80.00	20.00	22.70	77.30	43.66*
A x P	80.00	20.00	20.90	79.10	47.51*
S x A x P	80.00	20.00	20.90	79.10	47.51*
Adjusted Probability					
Cognitive Styles	0.00	100.00	0.60	99.40	0.20
Abilities (A)	14.30	85.70	3.50	96.50	6.74**
Aptitudes (P)	11.40	88.60	2.90	97.10	5.08***
S x A	22.90	77.10	3.50	96.50	17.30*
S x P	25.70	74.30	4.10	95.90	19.10*
A x P	28.60	71.40	5.20	94.80	19.00*
S x A x P	34.30	65.70	3.50	96.50	34.74*

Note. Cognitive styles (S) are measures of G_f; abilities (A) and aptitudes (P) are measures of G_c.

*$\chi^2(1) \geq 10.83$; $p < .001$.

**$\chi^2(1) \geq 6.64$; $p < .01$.

***$\chi^2(1) \geq 3.84$; $p < .05$.

As shown in the equal probability analysis, the percentage of correct classifications for actual failures ranged from 68.6 to 80.0 percent; and of actual graduates, from 61.6 to 79.1 percent. More actual failures and graduates were correctly classified by G_c measures (abilities and aptitudes) than G_f measures (cognitive styles). When G_f measures were employed together with G_c measures, the three two-way interactions, and the one three-way interaction, the percentage of those correctly classified was always higher than when only G_f measures were used. For actual failures and graduates, using cognitive styles and abilities resulted in fewer being correctly classified than using either cognitive styles and aptitudes or abilities and aptitudes.

In the adjusted probability analysis, the percentage of correct classifications of actual failures ranged from 0 to 34.3 percent; and of actual graduates, from 94.8 to 99.4

percent. More actual failures and graduates were significantly and correctly classified using abilities and aptitudes, G_c measures, than using cognitive styles, G_f measures. When employing the three two-way interactions of these measures, abilities and aptitudes classified actual failures better than did cognitive styles and abilities or cognitive styles and aptitudes. Using these multivariate combinations classified actual graduates approximately equally well. Using the three-way interaction of these measures classified actual failures better than did the cognitive styles (G_f) measures.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results established that G_c measures (abilities or aptitudes), accounted for more of the discrimination between CMI failures and graduates than did G_f measures (cognitive styles). Assuming either equal or adjusted probability, G_c measures classified a greater number of actual failures and graduates correctly than did G_f measures. Employing these measures (G_c) simultaneously always classified a higher percentage of students correctly than did employing only G_f measures. Assuming adjusted probability, actual failures were classified better using abilities and aptitudes (all G_c indices) than by cognitive styles and abilities or cognitive styles and aptitudes (G_c and G_f indices combined).

The data demonstrated that G_c measures are more important for predicting performance in this CMI environment, an instance of a new instructional situation, than are G_f measures. Unlike Snow's (1980) speculations, these findings suggest that the unconventional educational environment used in this investigation was not necessarily dysfunctional for the more able students. In this situation, these students seemed to exercise, and capitalize on, those skills developed and applied in more traditional instructional settings. This study established that, in this new instructional situation, G_c was more important and G_f, less important--the opposite of Snow's assertions.

If the traditional instructional treatment is altered, as in the novel pedagogical situation used in this investigation, then the relevancy of G_c to learning is not lessened. Students who possess well-developed, conventional, academic aptitudes and abilities can apply them even in unorthodox, educational environments. Students who lack these accumulated skills will need to acquire them in order to benefit from nontraditional as well as traditional instruction. Evidently, G_c abilities and aptitudes, representing prior assemblies of performance processes, can be retrieved and applied anew in instructional situations unlike those experienced in the past. This implies that G_c begins to take on some of the alleged attributes of G_f, especially considering more extreme adaptations to novel educational environments. The declared distinction between long-term assembly for transfer to familiar new situations (G_c) and short-term assembly for transfer to unfamiliar new situations (G_f) tends to disappear.

Alternatively, if this difference does not vanish, G_c abilities and aptitudes appear to be adaptive and advantageous in innovative instructional situations such as the computer-

managed mastery learning employed in this research. G_f as well as G_c are associated with achievement in novel educational environments (i.e., ones that differ from those students experienced in the past). Contrary to Snow's expectations, both G_f and G_c are relevant in these instructional situations. The unconventional pedagogical treatment used in this study was not dysfunctional for more able students--those who can control and structure their own learning because of G_c acquired and required previously by conventional, educational experiences.

Since, within this context, G_c confers pervasive learning skills--not specific knowledge--it transcends the particular technology, symbol systems, content, and context of instruction. Regardless of whether students previously experienced novel educational settings, G_c seems to instill a general learning set to process and interpret this type of innovative instruction. Consequently, G_c would be expected to be important throughout the computer-managed course, even if this produced pronounced changes in the customary method of instruction. This need not be so with G_f. Possibly, the processing reflected by G_f was required periodically and differentially by the content, context, technology, and symbol systems of instruction (Federico, 1982, 1983). Because some or all of these usually change during a course, the relationship of G_f to learning may be lessened throughout the complete curriculum as demonstrated by this research.

Finally, the nontraditional instructional treatment used in this investigation may not have been innovative enough when compared to previously experienced educational environments. Consequently, computer-managed instruction would not elicit more accommodative G_f strategies than would conventional G_c abilities and aptitudes employed by students in traditional instructional settings.

REFERENCES

Baker, F. (1978). Computer-managed instruction: Theory and practice. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Bieri, J., Atkins, A., L., Briar, S., Leaman, R. L., Miller, H., & Tripodi, T. (1966). Clinical and social judgment: The discrimination of behavioral information. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Block J. (Ed.). (1974). Schools, society, and mastery learning. New York: Holt, Riehart, & Winston.

Bloom, B. (1974). An introduction to mastery learning. In J. Block (Ed.), Schools society and mastery learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Bloom, B. (1976). Human characteristics and school learning. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Carroll, J. B. (1975). Psychometric tests as cognitive tasks: A new "structure of intellect." In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), The nature of intelligence. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cattel, R. (1971). Abilities: Their structure, growth, and action. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Clayton, M., & Jackson, D. M. (1961). Equivalence range, acquiescence, and over-generalization. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 21, 371-382.

Cooley, W. W., & Lohnes, P. R. (1962). Multivariate procedures for the behavioral sciences. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Cronbach, L. J., & Snow , R. E. (1977). Aptitudes and instructional methods: A handbook for research on interactions. New York: Irvington Publishers.

Ekstrom, R. B., French, J. W., Harman, H. H., & Derman , D. (1976). Manual for kit of factor-referenced cognitive tests. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Federico, P-A. (1982). Individual differences in cognitive components and computer-managed mastery learning. Journal of Computer-based Instruction, 9. 10-18.

Federico, P-A. (1983). Changes in the components of achievement as students proceed through computer-managed instruction. Journal of Computer-based Instruction, 9, 156-168.

Federico, P-A., & Landis, D. B. (1984). Cognitive styles, abilities, and aptitudes: Are they dependent or independent? Contemporary Educational Psychology, 9, 146-161.

Jackson, D. N. (1974). Personality research form manual. Goshen, NY: Research Psychologist Press, Inc.

Kearsley, G. (1983). Computer-based training. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kearsley, G., Hunter, B., & Seidel, R. J. (1983a). Two decades of computer-based instruction projects: What have we learned? T. H. E. Journal, January, 90-94.

Kearsley, G., Hunter, B, & Seidel, R. J. (1983b). Two decades of computer-based instruction projects: What have we learned? T. H. E. Journal, February, 88-96.

Kogan, N. (1971). Educational implications of cognitive styles. In G. S. Lesser (Ed.), Psychology and educational practice. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Kulik, J. A., Kulik, C. C., & Cohen, P. A. (1980). Effectiveness of computer-based college teaching: A meta analysis of findings. Review of Educational Research, 50, 525-544.

Military Enlistment Processing Command ASVAB Procedures Manual (MEPCOM Manual 601-1). Fort Sheridan, IL: Headquarters, U. S. Military Enlistment Processing Command.

Orlansky, J., & String, J. (1980). Cost effectiveness of computer-based instruction in military training (IDA Paper P1375). Arlington, VA: Institute for Defense Analysis.

Orlansky, J., & String, J. (1981). Computer-based instruction for military training. Defense Management Journal, 46-54.

Overall, J. E., & Klett, C. J. (1972). Applied multivariate analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1958). The measurement and correlates of category width as a cognitive variable. Journal of Personality, 26, 532-544.

Rydell, S. T., & Rosen, E. (1966). Measurement and some correlates of need-cognition. Psychological Reports, 19(I-V19), 139-165. (Mongraph Supplement)

Snow, R. E. (1980). Aptitude processes. In R. E. Snow, P-A. Frederico, & W. E. Montague (Eds.), Aptitude, learning, and instruction: Cognitive process analyses of aptitude (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawerence Erlbaum Associates. Also published as NPRDC/ONR TR 81-5 (1981). San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center. (AD-A096 209).

Tatsuoka, M. M. (1971). Multivariate analysis: Techniques for educational and psychological research. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

Director of Navy Laboratories (ONT 0722)
Commanding Officer, Naval Aerospace Medical Research Laboratory, Pensacola
Commanding Officer, Naval Aerospace Medical Institute (Code 012), Pensacola
Commanding Officer, Naval Health Sciences Education and Training Command, Bethesda
Chief of Naval Research (Code 442), (Code 442PT)
Office of Naval Research, Detachment Pasadena
Office of Naval Research, London
Chief of Naval Education and Training (Code 00A), (Code N-21), (Code N-23)
Chief of Naval Technical Training (Code N-6)
Commanding Officer, Naval Technical Training Center, Corry Station (Code 101B), Pensacola
Commanding Officer, Naval Training Equipment Center (Technical Library) (5), (Code 10)
Commander, Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Alexandria (PERI-POT-I), (PERI-SZ)
Program Manager, Life Sciences Directorate, Bolling Air Force Base (AFOSR/NL)
Commander, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Brooks Air Force Base (Scientific and Technical Information Officer), (TSRL/Technical Library FL 2870)
Commander, OPSTNGDIV Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Williams Air Force Base (AFHRL/OT)
Commander, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (AFHRL/LR-TDC)
Commander, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Lowry Air Force Base (AFHRL/ID)
President, Naval War College (Code E-1121)
Superintendent, Naval Postgraduate School
Director of Research, U.S. Naval Academy
Institute for Defense Analyses, Science and Technology Division
Center for Naval Analyses
Defense Techical Information Center (DDAC) (2)